DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 713 IR 006 276

AUTHOR Magidson, Errol H.
TITLE The Impact of an "Out-of-Class" CBI Program.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Development of Computer Based Instructional Systems (Dallas, Texas, March 1-4, 1978); For related document, see ED 160 072

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Course Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *PLATO

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the impact of a change from primarily scheduled class usage of computer-based instruction (CBI) to primarily free period usage at the City Colleges of Chicago. This change resulted from an interpretation of funding guidelines that CBI was to be offered as a supportive service on a supplementary basis. Several strategies were used to facilitate a smooth transition which would minimize adverse effects on the overall amount of usage, student achievement, and student attitudes: (1) faculty who had used Plato previously were informed of the change on a personal basis, as well as by letter; (2) faculty involvement in CBI was strongly encouraged; and (3) an hourly schedule was prepared each week with subject listings arranged to help ensure that students wanting to study a particular subject would be given some priority. PLATO usage data collected both before and after the policy change were analyzed. A comparison was made of student attitudes towards CBI as shown on surveys administered before and after the policy change; faculty attitudes were solicited by questionnaire and by interview. Despite the lack of computer lesson space during prime-time usage and the short notice, the policy change was carried out successfully. (VT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165713

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE IMPACT OF AN "OUT-OF-CLASS" CBI PROGRAM

by

Errol M. Magidson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Hirschbuhl

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR006276

THE IMPACT OF AN "OUT-OF-CLASS" CBI PROGRAM

Errol M. Magidson, Assistant Professor of Social Science,
Kennedy-King College, City Colleges of Chicago

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of a change in format of student usage of computer-based instruction (CBI) from primarily scheduled class usage to primarily free-period usage. Such a policy change was carried out during the 1976-77 academic year at the City Colleges of Chicago, a community college system where PLATO (University of Illinois) has been used since 1972. This policy change resulted from an interpretation of funding guidelines that CBI was to be offered as a supportive service on a supplementary basis.

This study is focused on the CBI program at Kennedy-King College, one of the City Colleges of Chicago. The CBI program at Kennedy-King was initiated in November 1972 and has supported an intensive student usage program since the beginning of the 1974-75 academic year. Several thousand Kennedy-King students have studied hundreds of CBI lessons developed by faculty and staff of the City Colleges and by other PLATO authors in a variety of academic areas, chiefly biology, chemistry, English, and mathematics.

The results of this study will help CBI program administrators determine the feasibility of an out-of-class student usage program at their sites, and it will offer them guidelines for administering such a program.

PROBLEM

The PLATO Project staff of the City Colleges (including a coordinator and two lab assistants at Kennedy-King, as well as a director for the City Colleges and site personnel for three other campuses) faced the problem of how to facilitate the smooth transition of "in-class" student usage to "out-of-class" student usage so that the overall amount of usage, student achievement, and student attitudes would not be adversely affected.

Several constraints were posed by the policy change:

1) there was only a month's notice of the policy change; 2) available ECS (Extended Core Storage, or the amount of computer lesson space) was in such short supply that it might be difficult to accommodate more than eight or nine different lessons at any one time although there were 24 terminals; 3) some students would not have free time, while others would not use PLATO during their free time; and 4) faculty would no longer accompany their students to PLATO, which meant that content consultation would be severely curtailed.

The PLATO Project staff made three assumptions in their assessment of the situation: 1) students who were not encouraged to use CBI by their instructors would generally not use it; 2) faculty who were not involved in policy decisions would make less use of CBI and would be less likely to encourage their students and colleagues to use CBI than faculty who were involved; and 3) faculty who had used CBI previously and who had held positive attitudes towards CBI would continue to use it despite the policy change.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Several methods were used to help solve the problem:

1) Former PLATO users who were faculty were informed of the change on a personal basis, as well as by letter, during student registration. It was only a few weeks before spring semester registration that a commitment to make the policy change was made. This was also a time when faculty were on vacation. Sending the faculty a memorandum noting such an important change might have been interpreted as a callous administrative directive. On the other hand, waiting until after registration to announce the change would have resulted in less student usage. Registration afforded an excellent time for personally contacting former faculty users about the change.

2) Faculty involvement in CBI was strongly encouraged in several ways:

a. Former faculty users were asked to suggest ways to implement the new policy. Many of their suggestions were used to recruit faculty users for the spring semester, e.g., offering verbal encouragement to students during classes to use CBI, granting extra credit for time spent using CBI lessons or for the number of lessons

completed, and making specific CBI assignments.

b. Previous faculty users were requested to bring their classes for one or two introductory sessions during which their students would receive a short demonstration followed by lessons previously selected by their instructor. These introductory sessions were conducted primarily during the first three weeks of the spring semester. It was hoped that these sessions would permit more students to use CBI as soon as possible, to allow for more open usage throughout most of the semester, and to lessen the need for giving demonstrations to individual students.

c. Curriculum development groups representing biology, chemistry, English, and mathematics were continued, and released time (1/4 load) was given to a few instructors, including two Kennedy-King instructors, for participating in the curriculum meetings and for developing CBI lessons.

d. Several faculty were encouraged to participate in mini-experiments in which CBI format was compared to lecture format for various topics.

e. Adult education instructors who taught basic academic skills were allowed to continue having their students use PLATO as part of in-class laboratory work.

3) An hourly schedule was prepared each week. The schedule listed any scheduled classes or three priority subjects each hour from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., daily. The total number of times a particular subject was listed each week was based on the amount of usage that subject had received in previous semesters. At Kennedy-King, biology, chemistry, and English were listed most often. The subject listing was arranged to help ensure that students wanting to study a particular subject would be given some priority should there not be enough available terminals or computer lesson space. If a student were initially unable to use a lesson in one of the three priority subjects, he or she could request assistance from a PLATO staff member. If necessary, a student studying a lesson in a subject not listed that hour would be asked to return later. The other hours of PLATO availability (8 a.m. to 9 a.m., daily; 5 p.m. to 9 p.m., Monday through Thursday; and 5 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., Friday) did not require the listing of priority subjects because there was ample computer lesson space then.

4. On-line curriculum modules for various courses and subjects included an index of lessons which had been approved by appropriate curriculum development groups. Such a lesson index was particularly helpful for those students who were not in any of the CBI courses which were set up by an instructor.

DATA COLLECTION

PLATO usage data collected both before and after the policy change was analyzed. To help determine the affective consequences of the policy, a comparison was made of student attitudes towards CBI as shown on surveys administered before and after the policy change. The student questionnaires developed for the fall and spring semesters were based on one used by the Educational Testing Service to assess student attitudes towards CBI (Murphy and Appel, 1977). Faculty attitudes towards the new policy were solicited by questionnaire and by interview.

The data was not analyzed by the use of significance tests because experimental conditions could not be applied throughout. Instead, the data was summarized and discussed using usage figures and percentages (e.g., x% of the students under the in-class usage policy compared to y% of those under the out-of-class usage policy agreed that they would encourage their friends to take a course that uses PLATO).

No attempt was made to compare student achievement before and after the policy change other than through the attitudinal questionnaires. Although data on student achievement was collected in the mini-experiments, this information really compared CBI format to lecture format.

USAGE RESULTS

Total student and faculty contact hours* of PLATO use for the fall semester 1976 and for the spring semester 1977 were 15,517 and 14,712, respectively, or just under a 5.2 percent drop in total usage. Student usage for the two semesters was 14,054 and 12,667, respectively, or nearly a 9.9 percent drop in student usage. These figures reflect increased author and instructor usage of PLATO from 1463 contact hours in the fall semester to

*"Contact hours" as used here represents a tally of student users made once each hour on the half-hour.

2045 in the spring semester, representing a 39.9 percent increase in this type of usage. The number of faculty who had their students use CBI increased from 49 (87 courses) to 56 (101 courses), or an increase of 14.3 percent (16.1 percent increase in the number of courses).

The academic areas most often studied on PLATO during both semesters as indicated by on-line data showed biology and English ranked first and second, respectively. GED mathematics moved ahead of chemistry in terms of usage, which was followed by college mathematics and accounting. Other academic areas studied included data processing, engineering, music, physics, social science, and Spanish. Typing was added during the spring semester.

During the fall semester, an exact total of the number of different student users from on-line data cannot be determined because some of the usage was with special sign-ons called "multiples," which allow any number of students to use the same sign-on name. It is estimated that the total number of student users during the fall semester was 2,000. This increased to 2904 during the spring semester, including 309 students who signed on PLATO less than fifteen minutes. It should be pointed out that a number of students used PLATO in groups of two or three. An attempt was made to count everyone in the tallies, but, of course, computer-logged hours did not record their use.

In short, more students were served during the spring semester but for a shorter time, averaging just over three terminal hours each, and more faculty were served during the spring semester, as well.

Technical Constraints

The major technical constraints included terminal breakdowns, computer failures, and lack of computer lesson space (ECS). Terminal breakdowns, i.e., the average number of inoperable terminals per day, was about 1.2 out of 24 terminals for both semesters. It is interesting to note that this represented a substantial decrease in terminal failures from a daily average of five in the fall of 1974.

Computer system failures remained constant over the two semesters: PLATO "off" time including system and terminal failures was about five percent.

The most pressing constraint during both semesters, but particularly during the spring semester, was a lack of sufficient computer lesson space, which was somewhat inadequate to accommodate out-of-class usage. During mid-morning and afternoon hours, PLATO was able to serve no more than eight or nine different lessons at the same time. There was no way of determining just how many students were turned away or turned off because of this difficulty.

STUDENT ATTITUDES*

The fall survey (see p.13) posed twenty questions to which students could either "agree" or "disagree" and two open-ended questions requesting students to list what they liked and disliked most about PLATO. Students were also asked if they had used PLATO prior to the fall semester 1976. The twenty forced-choice questions were listed in random order. Each question could be placed into one of three categories: overall attitude, lesson characteristics, and mechanical aspects. The questions used in the spring survey were nearly the same except that inappropriate questions referring only to class use were eliminated or reworded. In the spring semester questionnaire (see p.15), students were also asked to indicate whether they preferred to use PLATO with their class or on their own.

Procedures

Because the type of usage for the two semesters differed, the procedures used to administer the surveys also differed. Toward the end of the fall semester, copies of the questionnaire were given to the 42 instructors who had had their students use PLATO during at least three class sessions. Most of the students in these classes had used PLATO at least seven hours during the semester, a few more than thirty hours. In the spring semester, students who happened to be using PLATO during two selected days near the end of the semester were given the survey.

Results

A total of 758 copies of the fall questionnaire were

*Information presented here on the fall 1976 survey study was adapted from the author's article (Magidson, in press).

completed and returned. Most were from biology classes (41 percent) and English classes (30 percent), reflecting the high usage by classes in these two academic areas. The rate of return was more than 85 percent of the copies of the questionnaire that were distributed by the instructors. Only 139 copies were received during the spring survey because of the different method used to administer the questionnaire. Biology (49 percent) and English (14 percent) users were also highly represented in the spring survey, reflecting the high usage by students in these areas. Most of the spring survey respondents were using PLATO during their free time when surveyed; some of them were part of a class using PLATO.

On the fall survey nearly 40 percent of the respondents indicated that they had used PLATO in a previous semester compared to 31.4 percent of those responding on the spring survey. Unfortunately, 18 percent of the fall semester subjects failed to answer this question compared to only one percent of the spring semester subjects.

The number of responses to each question and percent of "agree" responses are given in Table I (p.14) and in Table II (p.16). The results on both questionnaires were highly favorable in terms of the students' overall attitude towards PLATO, attitudes towards lesson characteristics, and attitudes towards the mechanical aspects. The percentages given are based on the total number of students responding to a particular question.

Concerning the students' overall attitude towards PLATO, 93.1 percent of the fall survey respondents compared to 94.9 percent of those responding to the same question on the spring survey agreed that they "would encourage their friends to take a course that uses PLATO." Only 6.8 percent of the fall survey respondents and only 6.2 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that "using PLATO is boring." Only 10.2 percent of the fall survey respondents and only 15.2 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that "PLATO makes me feel as though I am not a person." It is interesting to note that 91.2 percent of the fall semester respondents compared to 86.7 percent of the spring semester respondents agreed that "PLATO allows me to assume greater responsibility for my own work."

Concerning PLATO lesson characteristics, 93.2 percent of the fall survey respondents and 91.1 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that they "like PLATO

because it lets you take part at each step in the lesson." Over 91 percent of the fall and spring survey respondents agreed that "PLATO made good use of examples and illustrations"; 88.1 percent of the fall survey respondents and 89.7 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that "PLATO made helpful comments on my work." About 7.5 percent of the fall survey respondents and 10.3 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that most PLATO lessons were too difficult.

Concerning the mechanical aspects of PLATO, only 11.0 percent of the fall survey respondents and 14.4 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that the "mechanics of using the PLATO terminal distracted me from learning." Over 90 percent of the respondents on both surveys agreed that they "felt comfortable working with PLATO," and only 11.9 percent of the fall survey respondents and 16.5 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that "PLATO makes it difficult for me to learn because it always seems to be breaking down."

In only two instances were the differences in opinions between the two survey groups above seven percentage points and in these areas each difference was less than ten percentage points. Over 16 percent of the fall survey respondents agreed that "generally, PLATO did not give clear explanations of the material." The fact that students in the spring semester were more on their own in selecting lessons may help account for this difference. Just over 66 percent of the fall survey respondents compared to 75.2 percent of the spring survey respondents agreed that they "learn better in classes using PLATO than in classes that don't."

A comparison was made of the responses of those students who had indicated on the spring survey having used PLATO under both policies to those who indicated they were new users. The more experienced users noticed operational problems more often: 30.0 percent compared to 11.0 percent of the new users felt "PLATO makes it difficult for me to learn because it always seems to be breaking down," and 18.6 percent of them compared to 12.8 percent of the new users indicated that "the mechanics of using the PLATO terminal distracted me from learning." Perhaps these difficulties contributed to more of the experienced users feeling that PLATO was dehumanizing (25.6 percent to 9.6 percent). More of the students who had used PLATO in previous semesters noted that lessons were not giving "clear explanations of the material" (30.2 percent to 21.1

percent); yet they were more inclined to "encourage... friends to take a course that uses PLATO" (100 percent to 92.5 percent).

Over 72 percent of the spring survey respondents to the question on which way they preferred to use PLATO indicated "on my own" rather than "with my class." Nearly 61 percent of those who had indicated having used PLATO in previous semesters preferred using PLATO on their own time.

The open-ended answers on both questionnaires conformed to the overall positive impression indicated by the responses to the forced-choice questions. The most frequent answer to what students liked most on the fall form was "everything" (frequency of 42), which was the second most frequent answer (15) on the spring form. Other favorable responses with the highest frequency on both forms were categorized as "helpful," "clear and concise," and "step-by-step learning."

Not surprisingly, the most common response to what the students disliked most about PLATO was "none" or "nothing" (frequency of 88 on the fall form and 23 on the spring form). Although most of the unfavorable comments on the fall survey concerned the mechanical characteristics and failings of the computer and terminal, various kinds of difficulties with the lessons themselves were given most often on the spring survey.

Here are a few student comments from both semesters which reflect the students' overall opinion of PLATO:

1. "I found that if I didn't quite understand the teacher and went to PLATO, between the two of them I got some sort of understanding" (fall survey).

2. "I liked the humor of the machine" (fall survey).

3. "The breakdowns are a nuisance sometimes... There are very few criticisms that I can offer regarding the use of PLATO. I wish I had used it in previous years" (spring survey).

FACULTY ATTITUDES

Faculty who had their students use PLATO during the spring semester 1977 were surveyed to determine their attitudes towards PLATO in light of the new policy.

Nearly 93 percent (52 of 56) completed the questionnaire (see p.17). Forty-one or 78.8 percent of the respondents had accompanied their students to use PLATO less than three class periods. On the other hand, 57.7 percent had used PLATO with their students more than seven sessions during the fall semester.

Over 69 percent of the survey subjects favored the in-class usage policy, but only 7.7 percent indicated either that they were "not really sure whether or not I would use PLATO" again (3) or that they would "probably not" use PLATO again (1). No one indicated that they would "never" again use PLATO. Over 63 percent indicated that they would "absolutely" use PLATO again.

The most serious problems for their students were identified as "lack of computer space" (ranked first), followed by not "enough terminals" (ranked second). The faculty users seemed most satisfied with the appropriateness and the quality of the lessons.

The statement checked most often concerning possible attributes of PLATO was "gives students experience not otherwise feasible" (80.8 percent), followed by "saves time of instruction (53.8 percent), and by "allows better teaching of regular material"(50 percent).

In short, the faculty PLATO users were highly favorable towards CBI and towards continuing to have their students use CBI on an out-of-class basis despite their preference for in-class usage.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the lack of computer lesson space during prime-time usage and the short notice, the policy change from primarily class usage of CBI to primarily open usage was carried out successfully at Kennedy-King College during the spring semester 1977. There was only a 5.2 percent drop in total usage from 15,517 contact hours in the fall semester to 14,712 in the spring semester. Although student usage declined by 9.9 percent, author and instructor usage increased by 39.9 percent. The number of faculty who had had their students use CBI increased by 14.3 percent from 49 to 56.

The number of different students who were served increased from an estimated 2,000 in the fall semester 1976 to 2904 in the spring semester. Although there were

substantially more students who used PLATO during the spring semester than in the fall semester, the mean terminal hours of usage in the spring was much less.

Both student and faculty attitudes towards PLATO continued to be highly positive, though faculty preferred the in-class usage policy (69 percent of the faculty who were surveyed).

Student assessment of PLATO yielded these results: 1) they enjoyed using PLATO; 2) they did not believe it to be demoralizing; 3) they found its use helpful as a learning aid; 4) they experienced only minor difficulties operating the terminal; and 5) they believed that computer and terminal breakdowns posed some difficulties. Students who had used PLATO under both policies were probably more realistic in their assessment. They were more aware of lesson difficulties and terminal and computer breakdowns.

Faculty users of PLATO identified "lack of computer space" and not "enough terminals" as the most serious problems. They were most satisfied with lesson quality and appropriateness. They checked "gives students experience not otherwise feasible" and "saves time of instruction" most often as attributes of PLATO.

The policy change was also successful in light of these limitations: 1) many Kennedy-King College students have work or child-care commitments which severely limit their engaging in non-class activities; 2) the program had operated on an in-class basis for several years prior to the change, which meant that the program staff were much more experienced in administering in-class usage; and 3) the in-class usage policy makes CBI usage compulsory and thus assures comparatively high usage, while an out-of-class usage policy offers no such assurance.

The out-of-class usage policy has given students a greater opportunity to use CBI on a more independent and individualized basis. It has compelled students to be more responsible for their learning.

Recommendations

Administrators should take note of the following recommendations for achieving a successful CBI program:

1. Faculty involvement is important for encouraging high CBI usage and for ensuring that students will receive support and guidance and appropriate instruction. Instructors will also involve a large number of students through their courses, which will facilitate administration of the program, and they will be the best advocates for involving other instructors.

2. Curriculum development groups for specific academic areas and composed of faculty and CBI staff should be established to identify appropriate CBI lessons, to review and revise lessons, to organize student testing of lessons, and to suggest on-line curriculum modules including lesson indexes.

3. Some in-class usage, particularly introductory CBI sessions and some in-class laboratory sessions, should be retained.

4. A system of scheduling priorities should be set up to offer students some assurance that they will be accommodated. Scheduled classes, although restricted in a primarily open-usage program, should have highest priority, followed by usage in pre-selected academic areas, followed by other usage. Instructors and authors might best fall into the second category, or there might be one or two terminals set aside for their use. It is best not to schedule individual students or particular lessons during each hour because such scheduling may discourage high usage and may be difficult to administer. If possible, it is best to establish rules which permit students to use CBI at any available time with the understanding that they may be asked to leave if a student with a higher priority needs the terminal or more computer lesson space. Either an on-line site managing system or site personnel should administer the scheduling priorities. Copies of the schedule should be posted weekly and distributed to faculty CBI users.

REFERENCES

Magidson, Errol M., "Student Assessment of PLATO: What Students Like and Dislike about CAI," Educational Technology, in press.

Murphy, Richard T., and Appel, Lola Rhea, Evaluation of the PLATO IV Computer-based Education System in The Community College, Final Report, Contract No. NSF-C731. (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, June 1977), A-143-44.

12/76

Fall 1976
STUDENT PLATO SURVEY

COURSE AND SECTION _____ INSTRUCTOR _____

Have you used PLATO before this semester? __YES __NO

Please answer the following questions to give your opinions of PLATO. Your responses will help us evaluate and improve PLATO. Thank you.

1. I like PLATO because it lets you take part at each step in the lesson. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
2. PLATO is nothing but a baby-sitter for the teacher. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
3. I enjoyed using PLATO. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
4. Generally, PLATO did not give clear explanations of the material. __AGREE __DISAGREE
5. I felt comfortable working with PLATO. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
6. I would encourage my friends to take a course that uses PLATO. . __AGREE __DISAGREE
7. PLATO makes me feel as though I am not a person. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
8. PLATO made good use of examples and illustrations. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
9. Too much time was spent in this course using PLATO. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
10. PLATO makes it difficult for me to learn because it always seems to be breaking down. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
11. I like PLATO because you can make mistakes without being embarrassed. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
12. I learn better in classes using PLATO than in classes that don't. __AGREE __DISAGREE
13. Most PLATO lessons are too hard for me. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
14. PLATO seemed to know when I didn't understand the material. . __AGREE __DISAGREE
15. PLATO made helpful comments on my work. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
16. Even though I could have left PLATO at the end of the class period, I often continued working for at least a few minutes. . __AGREE __DISAGREE
17. PLATO allows me to assume greater responsibility for my own learning. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
18. The mechanics of using the PLATO terminal distracted me from learning. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
19. Using PLATO is boring. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
20. Computers ought to become more important in the everyday life of our society. . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
21. Please list the things you liked most about PLATO:
22. Please list the things you disliked most about PLATO:

TABLE I

Results of the Fall 1976 Student Survey on PLATO

Question	No. "agrees"	No. "disagrees"	Percent "agrees"
(Used PLATO before)	248	374	39.9
1	700	51	93.2
2	67	670	9.1
3	715	35	95.3
4	121	626	16.2
5	679	66	91.1
6	683	51	93.1
7	74	649	10.2
8	671	60	91.8
9	63	682	8.5
10	88	651	11.9
11	641	106	85.8
12	464	238	66.1
13	56	688	7.5
14	563	178	76.0
15	651	92	88.1
16	588	155	79.1
17	674	65	91.2
18	82	663	11.0
19	50	685	6.8
20	481	232	67.5

Spring 1977 4/77
STUDENT PLATO SURVEY

PLATO Course Code _____

Please answer the following questions to give your opinions of PLATO. Your responses will help us evaluate and improve PLATO. Thank you.

1. Is this the first semester you have used PLATO? . . . . . __YES __NO
2. I like PLATO because it lets you take part at each step in the lesson . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
3. Generally, PLATO did not give clear explanations of the material . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
4. I felt comfortable working with PLATO . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
5. I would encourage my friends to take a course that uses PLATO. __AGREE __DISAGREE
6. PLATO makes me feel as though I am not a person . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
7. PLATO made good use of examples and illustrations . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
8. PLATO makes it difficult for me to learn because it always seems to be breaking down . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
9. I like PLATO because you can make mistakes without being embarrassed . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
10. I learn better in classes using PLATO than in classes that don't . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
11. Most PLATO lessons are too hard for me . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
12. PLATO seemed to know when I didn't understand the material. __AGREE __DISAGREE
13. PLATO made helpful comments on my work . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
14. Sometimes I used PLATO for a longer time than I had planned. __AGREE __DISAGREE
15. PLATO allows me to assume greater responsibility for my own learning . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
16. The mechanics of using the PLATO terminal distracted me from learning . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
17. Using PLATO is boring . . . . . __AGREE __DISAGREE
18. Which way do you prefer to use PLATO: __With my class __On my own
19. Please list the things you liked most about PLATO:

20. Please list the things you disliked most about PLATO:

TABLE II

Results of the Spring 1977 Student Survey on PLATO

Question	No. "agrees"	No. "disagrees"	Percent "agrees"
1	94	43	68.6
2	123	12	91.1
3	32	100	24.2
4	124	13	90.5
5	130	7	94.9
6	21	117	15.2
7	125	12	91.2
8	22	111	16.5
9	115	21	84.6
10	100	33	75.2
11	14	122	10.3
12	107	26	80.5
13	122	14	89.7
14	115	20	85.2
15	117	18	86.7
16	20	119	14.4
17	8	130	5.8
18	34	89	27.6

FACULTY PLATO SURVEY: SPRING 1977

Dear Colleague:

We would be very grateful if you would take a few minutes to indicate your opinions of PLATO on this survey. Please return the completed survey form to the site coordinator at your college.

1. Name_____

2. Department_____ College_____

3. Class(es) using PLATO this semester (give PLATO course names):

number of classes.....	1	2	3	4	5
for each instructor.....	25	16	5	5	1

4. How many times have you accompanied each of your classes to PLATO:

number of times.....	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+
for this semester.....	3	31	7	2	8
for last semester.....		7	3	1	30

(did not use PLATO last semester) 11

5. Which way do you prefer having students use PLATO?

as part of class time 36
on an out-of-class basis 16

6. What are your opinions or suggestions regarding the out-of-class usage policy?

7. In the event you are teaching courses next semester for which there are applicable PLATO lessons, will you have your students use PLATO?

0 Never	15 Probably would
1 Probably Not	33 Absolutely!
3 Not really sure	

8. How did you encourage your students to use PLATO on their own time (e.g., made required assignments, gave special credit)?

giving assignments (24)
giving credit (18)

9. Would you like to have PLATO used more to administer and grade quizzes?

10 Yes 42 No

10. Which of the following were problems for your students who used PLATO? Please use this rating scale:

1 = never a problem, 2 = a minor problem

3 = a major problem

1	2	3	(frequency given below)
32	12	1	....Lessons not designed for our students
32	11	2	....Low quality of lessons
16	23	7	....Lack of lessons on desired topics
17	22	7	....System failures in the middle of lessons
19	19	6	....Keeping terminals repaired
7	24	14	....Having enough terminals for all students
8	19	18	....ECS (can't use all lessons at all times; lack of computer space)
15	28	3	....Student difficulties in use of equipment

11. Check the statements which you believe are true of PLATO:

42 Gives students experience not otherwise feasible

26 Allows better teaching of regular material

25 Permits more to be covered

20 Saves time of students

28 Saves time of instructors

21 Gives instructor better idea of student needs

(Survey subjects (instructors) by academic area:)

English	13	Mathematics	4
Biology	11	Engineering	2
GED Mathematics	8	Accounting	1
Chemistry	5	Other	8